

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-25 remain in this application. Claims 2 and 18 have been amended to correct typographical errors. Claims 1-3, 10, 19, and 20 have been amended to put them in better form. Applicants will prepare a new declaration and submit under separate cover.

### **OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS AND REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 4 and 18 were objected to. Applicants respectfully point out that claim 4 refers to multiple words (a feature not recited in claims 1-3). Therefore, the inclusion of the phrase “with the steps of claim 1 performed” appears to be proper. Claim 18 has been amended as requested by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to these claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to provide an enabling disclosure. In particular, the Office Action states that the “specification does not clearly address how to filter the over-sampled serial data if more than one glitch occur[s] adjacently at the receiver. If there is more than one glitch occur[ing] adjacently at the receiver, the receiver would not [be] able to correct multiple adjacent glitches.”

Taking claim 1 as an example, this claim recites a method where a word of over-sampled data is received. In the detecting operation, a sample bit between two opposite-value bits is detected (e.g., 010 or 101). In the third operation, the sample bit is inverted. The specification provides an enabling disclosure for performing this operations (see, e.g., Fig. 4). Claims 10 and 19 are similar. Claim 20 refers to XORing and ANDing sample bits with adjacent bits, which is

shown, for example, in Fig. 4. Accordingly, it has been shown that the independent claims are enabled by the present specification. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. If the Examiner is to maintain this rejection, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner point out what claim language is not supported/enabled by the specification as filed. (See, e.g., MPEP § 2164.04)

Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as failing to distinctly claim the invention. The Examiner made specific objections to claim language in claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 14, 19, 20 and 22. With respect to claims 1, 2 (and 3), 10, 19, and 20, these claims have been amended to make the language clearer. With respect to claims 4, 14, and 22, the language of these claims meets the requirements of § 112, second paragraph as filed. The least significant bit (not the most significant bit) of a last previous word would be adjacent to the most significant bit of the following word (See the bottom of page 7 of the present application). In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.



### CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4200 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,  
KENYON & KENYON

Dated: March 30, 2004

By: *Shawn W. O'Dowd*  
Shawn W. O'Dowd  
Reg. No. 34,687

KENYON & KENYON  
1500 K Street, NW  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 220-4200 telephone  
(202) 220-4201 facsimile  
DC-488341

**RECEIVED**  
**APR 02 2004**  
Technology Center 2100

DC01 488341 v 1